RECEIVED
FEB 28 1927
Lindsay S. B. Hadley

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

J. GRESHAM MACHEN
POST OFFICE ADDRESS
BOX 4, PRINCETON, N. J.

Candidate:
MAR 2 1928
Filing Dept.

February 27, 1928

Rev. Lindsay S. B. Hadley,
Candidate Secretary,
Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions,
156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

My dear Mr. Hadley:-

I have been interested in recommending certain students of Princeton Seminary for service in the Presbyterian Church in Canada during the summer. In doing so, I find that the impression has been made upon some of the students that you are inclined to look with disfavor upon entrance into such work by candidates for appointment to the foreign field under our Board. It would hardly seem natural that this impression should be correct, since the Presbyterian Church in Canada, as you are no doubt aware, has the same Standards as has our own Church. But in order that I might set the minds of these students at ease, I should be grateful if you would inform me what your attitude in the matter is.

Since the students are just now engaged in making definite plans for summer work, I should appreciate the favor of an early reply.

Very truly yours,

J. Gresham Machen

Candidate
MAR 2 1928
Filing Dept.

March 1, 1928

Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D.,
Box 4, Princeton, New Jersey

My dear Dr. Machen:

Your letter has just come and I think my attitude as to the Church in Canada has somehow been misinterpreted. The only instances in which I have discussed the matter have been when I was seeking to find out just what the qualities of cooperation on the part of the candidate were.

In our blank, authorized by the General Assembly, the question is asked:- "Does your experience justify the belief that you can cheerfully accept and support the decision of a majority, even if the decision is contrary to your own opinions? Harmonious team work is indispensable." In the case in point, this question was answered with a reservation, and I sought to go into all of the candidate's experiences which would throw any light upon his ability to work happily in cooperation with the other folks on the field.

The question was not at all theological, but practically dealing with the question of team work. I am sure the fact that the candidate had worked with the Continuing Church in Canada would as such have no bearing upon his appointment under our Board.

I had hoped to meet you when at Princeton last time and called at your room with one or two of the students, but you were out.

I appreciate your writing frankly about the matter, and hope that this letter will clear up the situation.

Very cordially yours,

LSBM:IO

Candidate Secretary

RECEIVED
MAR 7 1927
Lindsay S. B. Hadley

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

J. GRESHAM MACHEN
POST OFFICE ADDRESS
BOX 4, PRINCETON, N. J.

Candidate
MAR 9 1928
Filing Dept.

March 7, 1928

Rev. Lindsay S. B. Hadley,
Candidate Secretary,
The Board of Foreign Missions,
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.,
156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

My dear Mr. Hadley:

Please let me thank you for your letter of March 1st in reply to mine of February 27th.

I am glad to note that the fact that a candidate has worked with the Presbyterian Church in Canada would have no bearing against his appointment to the foreign field under our Board. But the language in which this assurance is given increases rather than diminishes the perplexity which prompted my former letter.

You say: "I am sure the fact that the candidate had worked with the Continuing Church in Canada would as such have no bearing upon his appointment under our Board."

The words "as such" in this sentence, when taken in connection with the preceding paragraph, seem clearly to mean that although the mere connection of a candidate with the Presbyterian Church in Canada would not be looked upon with disfavor by you or by our Board of Foreign Missions, yet agreement on the part of the candidate with the decision to which that Church owes its present existence -- the decision of a minority in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada and a minority among the congregations in that Church not to relinguish the Westminster Standards and enter into the United Church -- <u>would</u> be looked upon with disfavor. The meaning of your letter seems to be that that willingness to "accept and support the decision of a majority" which you insist that a candidate shall profess includes a willingness to accept and support the decision of a majority regarding measures like the abandonment of the Westminster Standards and entrance into the United Church by the majority of the Canadian General Assembly in 1925.

Will you please inform me whether this understanding of your letter is correct?

Very sincerely yours,

J. Gresham Machen

Candidate:
MAR 9 1928
Filing Dept.

March 8, 1928

Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D.,
Box 4, Princeton, New Jersey

My dear Dr. Machen:

Your letter of March 7th has just come, and I assure you the words "as such" have no such interpretation as you have suggested.

As I said, the fact that the candidate had worked in the Continuing Church in Canada would have no bearing upon his appointment under our Board save as furnishing further opportunity to know the general qualifications of the candidate, which such an experience would offer in the same way that a preaching experience in this country would provide.

I am sending you a copy of the blank with which you are, of course, familiar, but I would call your attention to the particular question which I presume gave rise to the statement to which you referred in your letter of February 27th. The question in point is No. 17, on the second page of the blank, and you will notice that the word used is "opinions". This question, as I understand it, has nothing to do with a man's convictions, which naturally we, who are interested in Christian work, would expect a man to hold to firmly throughout. Such statements, however, would come on page 3 under "Religious Experience", which, as you will see are very definite.

Consequently, as I said before, the only question that came up so far as I recall, was the question of temperament and ability to work in fullest harmony with people in the small group which is usually found in a mission station, and did not involve such questions as the Westminster Standards, on which points the candidate was perfectly clear.

I can easily understand how such information coming in a roundabout way, would be easily confused and misrepresented, and I trust that this letter will make clear to you the answer to your question of February 27th, and if not, let me assure you I shall be very glad to give you any further information which you may desire.

Very sincerely yours,

LSBY:IO

Candidate Secretary

RECEIVED
APR 9 - 1928
Lindsay S. B. Hadley

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

J. GRESHAM MACHEN
POST OFFICE ADDRESS
BOX 4, PRINCETON, N. J.

Candidate
APR 1 - 1928
Filing Dept.

April 7th, 1928.

Rev. Lindsay S. B. Hadley,
Candidate Secretary,
The Board of Foreign Missions
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.,
156 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

My dear Mr. Hadley:

Please let me thank you for your letter of March 8th. I am glad to note that your letter of March 1st is not to be interpreted as meaning that you regard Question No. 17 in your Application Form as requiring a candidate to subject his doctrinal convictions to majority vote.

At the same time, my perplexity is by no means altogether removed.

In the first place, I do not think that the distinction between "convictions" and "opinions" can be easily drawn. The man who holds a certain view is always inclined to regard that view as a "conviction"; the man who does not share it is inclined to regard it as an "opinion." I do not see, therefore, how any Christian man - certainly how any Protestant - can possibly answer Question No. 17 without qualification in the affirmative, as your letter of March 8th apparently requires that a candidate should do. My view about this matter seems clearly to be supported by Chapter I Section iv. of the "Form of Government", where it will be observed that the word "opinion" and not the word "conviction" is used:

> "And that no opinion can be either more pernicious or more absurd, than that which brings truth and falsehood upon a level, and represents it as of no consequence <u>what a man's opinions are</u>" (italics mine).

In the second place, Section IV of the Form does not seem to me at all to safeguard the candidate's right to maintain his convictions as to the truth and as to the necessity of the Confession of Faith of our Church. That section, far from being very definite , seems to me to be exceedingly vague. And one question in it might even be interpreted as being hostile, rather than favorable, to the maintenance by the candidate of his convictions as to the faith of our Church. I refer to the Question 3: "Have you any views which might prevent your harmonious cooperation with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church?" I do not see how any member of the evangelical party in our Church could possibly answer that question with an unqualified affirmative. Nearly thirteen hundred Presbyterian

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

J. GRESHAM MACHEN
POST OFFICE ADDRESS
BOX 4, PRINCETON, N. J.

ministers have signed a document commonly called the Auburn Affirmation, which declares that the virgin birth and bodily ressurection of our Lord, together with three other basic articles of the common faith of Christendom, are non-essential even for the ministry in our Church. Is there any assurance that such a point of view may not be represented on the mission field? Such assurance would hardly seem to be very plain, since among the fourteen ministerial members of the Board of Foreign Missions itself there are no less than four signers of the Affirmation. And if such a point of view should be represented on the mission field, how could a candidate of consistently evangelical views possibly say that he has not any views which might prevent his harmonious cooperation with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church? Would not a man of evangelical convictions be obliged to qualify his answer? Would he not be obliged to say: "I have no views which might prevent my harmonious cooperation with the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church provided those missionaries hold to the truth of the Bible and to the Confession of Faith of our Church."

In the third place, the emphasis which, as interpreted by your letters, the Application Form seems to place upon a candidate's willingness to abide by the decision of a majority at the expense of clear-cut devotion to the Reformed Faith, is confirmed by the Candidate Reference Blank which I have received a number of times from the Board when information is requested regarding prospective missionaries.

That reference blank includes among commendable qualities about whose possession by the candidate information is desired, such things as "tolerance of point of view of others", "desire to progress in spiritual truth", "sanity" (explained as "absence of tendency to extreme views"). Clearly a high mark with regard to these qualities is treated as being in the candidate's favor. No doubt there is a sense in which these questions can be answered in the affirmative even in the case of a man who is most clearly determined to be loyal to Christ and to be separate from the unbelieving world. But the trouble is that there are no other questions in this blank to determine whether the candidate is resolved not to tolerate the point of view of those who are opposed to the gospel of Christ and whether he himself is clear in his understanding of the great issue between naturalism and supernaturalism, evangelical religion and non-doctrinal religion, which now faces the world. There is, moreover, not one word to determine the candidate's intellectual attainments as over against his intellectual capacity; there is not one word to determine his knowledge of the contents of the gospel. Is

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

J. GRESHAM MACHEN
POST OFFICE ADDRESS
BOX 4, PRINCETON, N. J.

not such a questionnaire, because of the choice of leading questions, in the interests of a tendency which might well be regarded as hostile to any clear upholding of the gospel of the Cross as the only way of salavation? Certainly if it is not to be used in the interests of such a tendency, the impression made upon candidates by their interviews with the representatives of the Board will have to be different from what it has been during the past few years.

In the fourth place, I am still not clear about the meaning of your letter of March 8th. I rejoice in your assurance as to what it does not mean, but I still do not understand what it does mean. I still do not see how, if your conversation with the candidate was similar, in content, to that letter, the candidate could have helped drawing the conclusion that failure to acquiesce in a church union movement like that involved in the formation of the United Church of Canada would be looked upon with disfavor by our Board. The criticism which has been widely expressed against the minority in the Canadian General Assembly of 1925 which declined to enter the United Church is exactly the criticism which seems to be involved in your attitude toward a negative or qualified answer to Question 17 of your Form. It is that the persons who made such a decision failed to "play the game" by abiding by the principle of majority rule. That criticism has indeed always seemed to me to be unaccountable; I have never been able to understand how persons who really hold to the Reformed Faith - the faith for which our fathers bled and died - could be expected to put aside that Faith (by entrance into the United Church) as though they were merely changing a suit of clothes. But unaccountable though the criticism is, the fact remains that it is very widespread indeed. And in view of its prevalence I do not see how a candidate could have helped drawing from expressions like those in your letter of March 8th to me any conclusion other than that agreement with a decision like that of the Canadian minority against Church Union would be looked upon with disfavor by our Board. I am glad to note that this conclusion is not correct. But it does seem to me to have been very natural. And I am still not clear as to what yiur letter did actually mean.

Very sincerely yours,

J. Gresham Machen

Cancelled
APR 14 1928
Filing Dept.

April 13, 1928

Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D.,
Box 4, Princeton, N.J.

My dear Dr. Machen:

Thank you for your letter of April 7th. I am very sorry indeed that my letter is not more plain. I do not see any way of improving it unless by the opportunity of talking with you sometime when I am at Princeton, or when you are here in New York, which I hope we may be able to do.

I shall bring your observations on the application blank to the Committee, as they are always glad of suggestions which will clarify the matter and make simpler the task of ascertaining whether the candidate is fitted in every way to be an ambassador of Christ in a foreign land.

Appreciating your careful consideration of the blank, I am,

Very cordially yours,

LSBW:IO

Candidate Secretary

RECEIVED
MAR 7 1929
Lindsay S. B. Hadley

Candidate
MAR 18 1929
Filing Dept.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

J. GRESHAM MACHEN
POST OFFICE ADDRESS
BOX 4, PRINCETON, N. J.

Mr Hadley will see Mar. 19

March 5, 1929

Rev. Lindsay S.B.Hadley,
The Board of Foreign Missions of the
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.,
156 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

My dear Mr. Hadley:

At the close of an extended correspondence, embracing my letters to you of February 27, 1928, March 7 and April 7, and your letters to me of March 1, March 8 and April 13, you wrote to me, under date of April 13, 1928, as follows:

> "I shall bring your observations on the application blank to the Committee, as they are always glad of suggestions which will clarify the matter and make simpler the task of ascertaining whether the candidate is fitted in every way to be an ambassador of Christ in a foreign land."

Since that time I have heard nothing regarding the result of this consideration by the Committee. Am I correct in understanding that the staff of the Board of Foreign Missions does not desire to make any further reply to the considerations that I adduced in the course of the correspondence?

I may say that when I wrote my letter of April 7th, in the second paragraph of which I referred to the presence among the members of the Board of Foreign Missions of signers of the Auburn Affirmation, I was not aware of the fact that you yourself are a signer of the Affirmation. That fact renders even more insistent the objection which members of the evangelical party in the Church must raise against Question 3 of Section IV of the Application Form.

Very sincerely yours.

J. Gresham Machen

Cand/Filed
MAR 30 1929
Filing Dept.

March 28, 1929

Rev. J. Gresham Machen, D.D.,
Box 4, Princeton, N.J.

My dear Dr. Machen:

Your letter came some days ago, and I had hoped to see you and talk with you when I was in Princeton recently. So many engagements had been made for me, however, that I was not able to do so. I have called at your rooms twice, since my letter of last spring, both times only to find you out.

May I say that there has been a Committee appointed to consider the whole question of the blanks, and naturally all suggestions such as you have given would be submitted to such a Committee. I did not realize that you wanted a report on the matter.

Personally, it seems to me that Question 3, under Section IV of the application form states very clearly that our missionaries of the Presbyterian Church have been duly ordained and appointed as messengers of the Gospel of Christ, with the full approval of the duly constituted authorities, and any new missionaries appointed should be men who can work in harmony with such faithful and approved workers. When the emphasis is placed upon the splendid loyalty and fitness of those who have been appointed, there does not seem to me to be the difficulty which you would suggest.

I am sorry that my letters are so unsatisfactory to you, and I am sure that there are many of the older men, such as Dr. Speer or Dr. Brown, who could give you a much more satisfactory answer.

Very sincerely yours,

LSBH:IO

Candidate Secretary

RECEIVED
APR 6 1929
Lindsay S. B. Hadley

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

J. GRESHAM MACHEN
POST OFFICE ADDRESS
BOX 4, PRINCETON, N. J.

Candidate
APR 11 1929
Filing Dept

April 5, 1929

Candidate Department,
The Board of Foreign Missions,
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.,
156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Gentlemen:

Will you be kind enough to send me an extra copy of the Candidate Reference Blank, which I have filled out a number of times at your request? I desire to have a copy for my file.

Very sincerely yours,

J. Gresham Machen

Correspondence
APR 11 1929
Filing Dept.

April 10, 1929

Dr. J. Gresham Machen,
Box 4,
Princeton, New Jersey.

My dear Dr. Gresham;

I am very glad indeed to send you a copy of the Reference Blank which you have requested.

Very sincerely yours,

Candidate Secretary.

LSBH:CAS

Enc.- Reference Blank.

J. Gresham Machen

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

J. GRESHAM MACHEN
POST OFFICE ADDRESS
BOX 4, PRINCETON, N. J.

April 12th, 1929.

3

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
The Board of Foreign Missions,
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.,
156 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

My dear Dr. Speer:

Your will no doubt remember that in 1926 you and Dr. Marquis were in correspondence with me regarding my criticism of the Boards of Foreign Missions and National Missions. The correspondence embraced your letters (signed jointly by you and by Dr. Marquis) of March 24, April 8, May 6, June 28, Dr. Marquis' letter of October 6, and my letters of March 30, April 30, May 25, August 9, and October 29. A similar subject was dealt with by Dr. John McDowell's letter of January 13, 1927, and by my reply of January 27, 1927, which reply, since it dealt chiefly with the Board of Foreign Missions, Dr. McDowell had my express permission to show to you.

May I call your attention, also, to a correspondence which I have had with the Rev. Lindsay S. B. Hadley, Candidate Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions -- a correspondence embracing my letters of February 27, March 7, April 7, 1928, and March 5, 1929, and Mr. Hadley's letters of March 1, March 8, April 13, 1928, and March 28, 1929. In the last letter Mr. Hadley refers me to you and to Dr. Brown. No doubt, therefore, I am not acting contrary to his wishes when I bring the correspondence to your attention.

In my letter to you of March 30, 1926, I mentioned my intention "to prepare a statement which will set forth more in detail my views on the subject of the Boards and will ground my objections to their policy more fully than was possible in a general address."

This intention I have been as yet unable, because of the press of other duties, to carry out in any comprehensive way. But my objections to the policy of the Foreign Board have not become less but rather greater than in 1926; and there are certain phases of the subject which I am inclined to think that I ought immediately to bring to the attention of persons of evangelical conviction in the Presbyterian Church.

Accordingly, I am enclosing a paper which I have prepared, entitled "Can Evangelical Christians Support our Foreign

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

J. GRESHAM MACHEN
POST OFFICE ADDRESS
BOX 4, PRINCETON, N. J.

Board?" You will understand that it is not yet released for publication, but is submitted to you for examination and criticism. If there is anything in what I have said that is untrue or unjust, I am of course very anxious to correct it. I shall be extremely grateful for any assistance that you may render to that end.

Very sincerely yours,

J. Gresham Machen

COPY

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, New Jersey

April 14, 1933

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
The Board of Foreign Missions
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
156 Fifth Avenue, New York City

My dear Dr. Speer:

You will no doubt remember that in 1926 you and Dr. Marquis were in correspondence with me regarding my criticism of the Boards of Foreign and National Missions. The correspondence embraced your letters (signed jointly by you and by Dr. Marquis) of March 24, April 8, May 6, June 28, Dr. Marquis' letter of October 6, and my letters of March 30, April 30, May 16, August 9, and October 28. A similar subject was dealt with by Dr. John McDowell in letter of January 18, 1927, and by my reply of January 27, 1927, which reply, since it dealt chiefly with the Board of Foreign Missions, Dr. McDowell had my express permission to show to you.

May I call your attention, also, to a correspondence which I have had with the Rev. Lindsay S.B. Hadley, Candidate Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions -- a correspondence embracing my letters of February 27, March 7, April 7, 1928 and March 5, 1929, and Mr. Hadley's letters of March 1, March 8, April 13, 1928, and March 28, 1929. In the last letter Mr. Hadley refers us to you and to Dr. Brown. No doubt, therefore, I am not acting contrary to his wishes when I bring the correspondence to your attention.

In my letter to you of March 30, 1926, I mentioned my intention "to prepare a statement which will set forth more in detail my views on the subject of the Boards and will ground my objections to their policy more fully than was possible in a general address."

This intention I have been as yet unable, because of the press of other duties, to carry out in any comprehensive way. But my objections to the policy of the Foreign Board have not become less but rather greater than in 1926; and there are certain phases of the subject which I am inclined to think that I ought immediately to bring to the attention of persons of evangelical conviction in the Presbyterian Church.

Accordingly, I am enclosing a paper which I have prepared, entitled "Can Evangelical Christians Support our Foreign Board?" You will observe that it is not yet released for publication, but is submitted to you for examination and criticism. If there is anything in what I have said that is untrue or unjust, I am of course very anxious to correct it. I shall be extremely grateful for any assistance that you can render to that end.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) J. Gresham Machen.

COPY

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

April 14, 1929

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
The Board of Foreign Missions
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
156 Fifth Avenue, New York City

My Dear Dr. Speer:

You will no doubt remember that in 1926 you and Dr. Marquis were in correspondence with me regarding my criticism of the Boards of Foreign and National Missions. The correspondence embraced your letters (signed jointly by you and by Dr. Marquis) of March 24, April 8, May 6, June 28, Dr. Marquis' letter of October 6, and my letters of March 30, April 30, May 6, August 9, and October 22. A similar subject was dealt with by Dr. John McDowell's letter of January 13, 1927, and by my reply of January 27, 1927, which reply, since it dealt chiefly with the Board of Foreign Missions, Dr. McDowell had my express permission to show to you.

May I call your attention, also, to a correspondence which I have had with the Rev. Lindsay S.M. Hadley, Candidate Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions -- a correspondence embracing my letters of February 27, March 7, April 7, 1926 and March 5, 1928, and Mr. Hadley's letters of March 1, March 6, April 13, 1926, and March 28, 1928. In the last letter Mr. Hadley refers me to you and to Dr. Brown. No doubt, therefore, I am not acting contrary to his wishes when I bring the correspondence to your attention.

In my letter to you of March 30, 1926, I mentioned my intention "to prepare a statement which will set forth more in detail my views on the subject of the Boards and will ground my objections to their policy more fully than was possible in a general address."

This intention I have been as yet unable, because of the press of other duties, to carry out in any comprehensive way. But my objections to the policy of the Foreign Board have not become less but rather greater than in 1926; and there are certain phases of the subject which I am inclined to think that I ought immediately to bring to the attention of partners of evangelical conviction in the Presbyterian Church.

Accordingly, I am enclosing a paper which I have prepared, entitled "Can Evangelical Christians Support our Foreign Board?" You will understand that it is not yet released for publication, but is submitted to you for examination and criticism. If there is anything in what I have said that is untrue or unjust, I am of course very anxious to correct it. I shall be extremely grateful for any assistance that you may render to that end.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) J. Gresham Machen.

COPY

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

April 14, 1940

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
The Board of Foreign Missions
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.,
156 Fifth Avenue, New York City

My dear Dr. Speer:

You will no doubt remember that in 1936 you and Dr. Vergeer were in correspondence with me regarding my criticisms of the Board of Foreign Missions and of Samuel Zwemer. The correspondence embraced your letters (signed jointly by you and Dr. Vergeer) of March 24, April 9, May 6, June 26, Dr. Vergeer's letter of October 6, and my letters of March 30, April 21, May 5, August 4 and October 19. A similar subject was dealt with by Dr. John Mitchell's letter of January 17, 1937, and by my reply of January 22, 1937, which reply, since it dealt chiefly with the Board of Foreign Missions, Dr. Mitchell had my express permission to show to you.

May I call your attention also to a correspondence which I have had with the Rev. Lindsay T. W. Hedley, Associate Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions -- a correspondence embracing my letters of February 27, March 7, April 7, 1939, and March 3, 1940, and Dr. Hedley's letters of March 6, March 8, April 18, 1939 and March 26, 1940. In the last letter Dr. Hedley refers me to you and to Dr. Brown. He asks, therefore, I am not acting contrary to his wishes when I bring the correspondence to your attention.

In my letter to you of March 30, 1936, I mentioned my intention "to prepare a statement which will set forth more in full my views on the subject of the Boards and will present my objections to their policy more fully than was possible in a personal interview.

This intention I have been as yet unable, because of the press of other duties, to carry out in any comprehensive way. But my objections to the policy of the Foreign Board have not become less but rather greater in bulk; and there are certain phases of the subject which I am inclined to think that I ought bravely to bring to the attention of persons of evangelical association in the Presbyterian Church.

Accordingly, I am enclosing a paper which I have prepared entitled "Are Evangelical Christians Support our Foreign Boards?" You will understand that it is not yet released for publication, but is submitted to you for examination and criticism. If there is anything in what I have said that is untrue or unjust, I am of course very anxious to correct it. I shall be extremely grateful for any assistance that you may render to that end.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) J. Gresham Machen.

COPY

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

April 12, 1929

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
The Board of Foreign Missions
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.,
156 Fifth Avenue, New York City

My dear Dr. Speer:

You will no doubt remember that in 1926 you and Dr. Marquis were in correspondence with me regarding my criticisms of the Boards of Foreign Missions and National Missions. The correspondence embraced your letters (signed jointly by and by Dr. Marquis) of March 24, April 8, May 6, June 28, Dr. Marquis' letter of October 6, and my letters of March 30, April 30, May 25, August 9 and October 29. A similar subject was dealt with by Dr. John McDowell's letter of January 13, 1927, and by my reply of January 27, 1927, which reply, since it dealt chiefly with the Board of Foreign Missions, Dr. McDowell had my express permission to show to you.

May I call your attention also to a correspondence which I have had with the Rev. Lindsay S. B. Hadley, Candidate Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions -- a correspondence embracing my letters of February 27, March 7, April 7, 1928, and March 5, 1929, and Mr. Hadley's letters of March 1, March 8, April 13, 1928 and March 28, 1929. In the last letter Mr. Hadley refers me to you and to Dr. Brown. No doubt, therefore, I am not acting contrary to his wishes when I bring the correspondence to your attention.

In my letter to you of March 30, 1926, I mentioned my intention "to prepare a statement which will set forth more in detail my views on the subject of the Boards and will ground my objections to their policy more fully than was possible in a general address.

This intention I have been as yet unable, because of the press of other duties, to carry out in any comprehensive way. But my objections to the policy of the Foreign Board have not become less but rather greater in 1926; and there are certain phases of the subject which I am inclined to think that I ought immediately to bring to the attention of persons of evangelical conviction in the Presbyterian Church.

Accordingly, I am enclosing a paper which I have prepared entitled "Can Evangelical Christians Support our Foreign Board?" You will understand that it is not yet released for publication, but is submitted to you for examination and criticism. If there is anything in what I have said that is untrue or unjust, I am of course very anxious to correct it. I shall be extremely grateful for any assistance that you may render to that end.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) J. Gresham Machen.

J Gresham Machen

B

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

J. GRESHAM MACHEN

POST OFFICE ADDRESS

BOX 4, PRINCETON, N. J.

May 4, 1929

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
The Board of Foreign Missions,
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.,
156 Fifth Avenue,
New York, N.Y.

My dear Dr. Speer:

Please let me thank you for your letter of April 30th, which has come into my hands today. I am exceedingly grateful for the careful way in which you have commented upon my paper, CAN EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANS SUPPORT OUR FOREIGN BOARD?

I wish that I could say that your letter had removed my objections to the policy of the Board of Foreign Missions, but in point of fact it has tended rather to the confirmation of those objections. My reply in detail will have to be deferred until I can give the considerations adduced in the letter the deatiled examination which they certainly deserve. Meanwhile I am deferring publication of my paper.

The appeal for peace in the Church and between us, with which your letter closes, seems rather strange at a time when you are actively engaged in the attack upon the conservative control of Princeton Seminary and in the effort to substitute the policy favored by the President for the policy which the institution is bound by the most solemn trust obligations to maintain. The policy of tolerance hardly seems to work both ways. The conservatives are not only to tolerate in the Church but also to give active support to the message that you proclaim; while you, on the other hand, are engaged in destroying almost the last remaining powerful agency which the conservatives possess for the propagation of their Faith in the Presbyterian Church.

Very sincerely yours,

Gresham Machen

COPY

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

J. Gresham Machen
P.O. Address - Box 4, Princeton, N.J.

May 4, 1933.

Dr. Robert E. Speer
The Board of Foreign Missions
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.,
156 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y.

My dear Dr. Speer:

Please let me thank you for your letter of April 30th, which has come into my hands today. I am exceedingly grateful for the careful way in which you have commented upon my paper, - CAN EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANS SUPPORT OUR FOREIGN BOARD?

I wish that I could say that your letter had removed my objections to the policy of the Board of Foreign Missions, but in point of fact it has tended rather to the confirmation of those objections. My reply in detail will have to be deferred until I can give the considerations adduced in the letter the detailed examination which they certainly deserve. Meanwhile I am deferring publication of my paper.

The appeal for peace in the Church and between us, with which your letter closes, seems rather strange at a time when you are actively engaged in the attack upon the conservative control of Princeton Seminary and in the effort to substitute the policy favored by the President for the policy which the institution is bound by the most solemn trust obligations to maintain. The policy of tolerance hardly seems to work both ways. The conservatives are not only to tolerate in the Church but also to give active support to the message that you proclaim; while you, on the other hand, are engaged in destroying almost the last remaining powerful agency which the conservatives possess for the propagation of their Faith in the Presbyterian Church.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) J. Gresham Machen.

COPY

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

J. Gresham Machen
P.O. Address - Box 4, Princeton, N.J.

May 4, 1929.

Dr. Robert E. Speer
The Board of Foreign Missions
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.,
156 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y.

My dear Dr. Speer:

Please let me thank you for your letter of April 30th, which has come into my hands today. I am exceedingly grateful for the careful way in which you have commented upon my paper, - CAN EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANS SUPPORT OUR FOREIGN BOARD?

I wish that I could say that your letter had removed my objections to the policy of the Board of Foreign Missions, but in point of fact it has tended rather to the confirmation of those objections. My reply in detail will have to be deferred until I can give the considerations adduced in the letter the detailed examination which they certainly deserve. Meanwhile I am deferring publication of my paper.

The appeal for peace in the Church and between us, with which your letter closes, seems rather strange at a time when you are actively engaged in the attack upon the conservative control of Princeton Seminary and in the effort to substitute the policy favored by the President for the policy which the institution is bound by the most solemn trust obligations to maintain. The policy of tolerance hardly seems to work both ways. The conservatives are not only to tolerate in the Church but also to give active support to the message that you proclaim; while you, on the other hand, are engaged in destroying almost the last remaining powerful agency which the conservatives possess for the propagation of their Faith in the Presbyterian Church.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) J. Gresham Machen.

COPY

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

J. Gresham Machen
P.O. Address - Box 4, Princeton, N.J.

May 4, 1929.

Dr. Robert E. Speer
The Board of Foreign Missions
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.,
156 Fifth Avenue
New York, N.Y.

My dear Dr. Speer:

Please let me thank you for your letter of April 30th, which has come into my hands today. I am exceedingly grateful for the careful way in which you have commented upon my paper, - CAN EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANS SUPPORT OUR FOREIGN BOARD?

I wish that I could say that your letter had removed my objections to the policy of the Board of Foreign Missions, but in point of fact it has tended rather to the confirmation of those objections. My reply in detail will have to be deferred until I can give the considerations adduced in the letter the detailed examination which they certainly deserve. Meanwhile I am deferring publication of my paper.

The appeal for peace in the Church and between us, with which your letter closes, seems rather strange at a time when you are actively engaged in the attack upon the conservative control of Princeton Seminary and in the effort to substitute the policy favored by the President for the policy which the institution is bound by the most solemn trust obligations to maintain. The policy of tolerance hardly seems to work both ways. The conservatives are not only to tolerate in the Church but also to give active support to the message that you proclaim; while you, on the other hand, are engaged in destroying almost the last remaining powerful agency which the conservatives possess for the propagation of their Faith in the Presbyterian Church.

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) J. Gresham Machen.

J. Gresham Machen

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

J. GRESHAM MACHEN
POST OFFICE ADDRESS
BOX 4, PRINCETON, N. J.

1113

May 10, 1929.

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
The Board of Foreign Missions,
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.,
156 Fifth Avenue,
New York, N. Y.

My dear Dr. Speer:

As I said in my letter of May 4, I am postponing my answer to your letter of April 30 until I can give it the careful examination which it requires.

There is one matter of fact, however, about which I should be grateful for information. On page 3 of your letter, near the bottom of the page, you refer to a Princeton Seminary student who had recently been working in the Presbyterian Church in Canada and who was appointed by your Board. This was certainly not any student to whom I referred. May I ask who it was?

Very sincerely yours,

J. Gresham Machen

Bruce Hunt to Chosen - Cooperation
about Mr Lord & China

DUPLICATE

June 3, 1929

Rev. William L. McEwan, D.D.
906 So. Negley Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pa.

My dear William:

Your good letter of May 31st is just received. I looked about to see you after the determination of the Princeton matter on Monday but did not get a glimpse of you again. I hope you got safely home without too much discomfort from the excessive heat.

I was sorry to have had to take part in the discussion but perhaps it was just as well for Dr. Laird and me to speak in fulfilment of our commission from the majority of the Board.

It was certainly a strange proceeding by which on Monday afternoon the third motion was proposed which excluded any vote on our majority report. One would like to know the history of that motion: I have some suspicions with regard to it. I do not believe, however, that our report would have been adopted even if the Assembly had had an opportunity to vote upon it. If six months ago our Board of Directors could have united upon it with substantial unanimity I think we could have pursuaded the Trustees and also the Committee of Eleven. All that is past now, however, and one must believe that God's will was different from our endeavor.

I trust that the new Board at its meeting on June 14th may be led of God's spirit and given wisdom and courage and love. I do earnestly wish, however, that I might be relieved from service on it. I beggged Dr. Thompson not to include my name on the new Board list. It would be a compensation for service on the new Board to see you from time to time but I hope I can have this joy without the duty of such further service.

You may remember my telling you and Dr. Laird of Dr. Machen's letter and paper entitled "Can Evangelical Christians Support our Foreign Board?" I have not shown this paper or my reply to any one outside of Mrs. Speer, and Dr. Brown and Mr. Hadley but I think I will send the correspondence to you. Will you please return it with any word of advice as to my future course? Dr. Machen has acknowledged the receipt of ~~the~~ my reply of April 30th in a letter of May 4th of which also I enclose a copy. Will you please return all of these when you have read them with your word of counsel?

Ever affectionately yours,

RES/B

SHOULD WE GO BACK FURTHER THAN 1915,

IF SO IT WILL MEAN GOING THRU THE FILES ON THE

13th FLOOR?

Wm L. McEwan

Third Presbyterian Church.
Pittsburgh, Pa.

RECEIVED
JUN 2 1929
RECEIVED
JUN 28 1929

June 26, 1929.

Dr. Robert E. Speer
Board of Foreign Missions
156 Fifth Avenue
New York City, N. Y.

My Dear Robert:

Coming down on the train this morning, I had an apportunity to re-read carefully Dr. Machen's paper and your answer to it. I did not need your answer to have my own reaction to his paper and its criticism of your little book. I had read the book sufficiently carefully to have my own high estimate of its value. Dr. Machen certainly does not furnish proof in his paper for the opinions he expresses. My own belief is that he has his suspicions on other grounds and uses them as he reads your book. I am also of the opinion that the fact that Dr. Erdman and Dr. Stevenson are members of the Foreign Board are the real cause of his attitude. I esteem Dr. Machen most highly and admire his scholarship and his spirit in dealing with individuals, but I can not understand how a man of such fine fibered nature and such large attainments could entertain such suspicions as to cause him to refuse to believe in the solemn statements of such men as he opposes.

I read your reply more closely and critically than I did his article. I wish to call your attention to the first paragraph of your article following the quotations on Page 11. In that paragraph, you state that if he does certain things, he will receive an inevitable penalty. I think that you had better not say this in this way. You have exercised remarkable restraint in all the rest of your paper. There is in this utterance what seems to me to be a little different spirit than that which prevades the whole paper and you threaten or pronounce judgment in a way that is not exactly like you. I take the liberty of calling your attention to this particular paragraph because I want your answer to be above criticism in the reply to a paper that is full of criticism. I feel the proof of your friendship in permitting me to be among the small number to whom you have shown this paper, and out of that return of friendship and confidence, I am presuming to offer this suggestion. As I am dictating in a hurry before going to a meeting for which I came down from the country, I can not write further at this time. I am enclosing the copies of the papers. With sincere friendship.

Your friend truly,

William L. McEwan

wlm;arl

THE BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS
OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.
156 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

MEMORANDUM

FROM

TO

The following question appeared on blank issured in the year 1915, under No. 26.

"In mission matters will you cheerfully acquiesce in the decision of a majority, after clearly station your opinions?"

In the new form re-printed in 1922, the question read as follows, under No. 17:-

"Does your experience justify the belief that you can cheerfully accept and support the decision of a majority, even if the decision is contrary to your own opinions? Harmonious team work is indispensable?"

On the blank for ordained men the question is the same as above, under No. 17.

The mimeograph enclosure was first added to the application in 1923 but was only enclosed in the layman's blank and not in the blank for the ordained men.

J. Gresham Machen

WESTMINSTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA

J. GRESHAM MACHEN
POST OFFICE ADDRESS
208 SOUTH THIRTEENTH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

April 8, 1933.

Dr. Robert E. Speer,
The Board of Foreign Missions of the
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.,
156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

My dear Dr. Speer:

It was a very special courtesy on your part to arrange with the Fleming H. Revell Company for sending me advance copies of your book THE FINALITY OF JESUS CHRIST. I have found the book very useful in my preparation for next Tuesday, and I hope to be able to comment on it in somewhat more adequate fashion at a future time.

Yesterday I sent you by first class mail two copies of my printed "Argument" -- one to your address in Englewood and one to 156 Fifth Avenue. No doubt one or the other of these has already come into your hands.

Very sincerely yours,

J. Gresham Machen